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Executive Summary

The respondents of this study represent 31% of the University’s full-time faculty. These professors comment that their students generally view the resources of the University’s library as being adequate. To attain a more valid conclusion, it is suggested that the students be surveyed. Overall the comments made by the professors for improving the library have focused on the library’s current material inventory. They suggest that more up-to-date and field specific materials are purchased to make the library more useful for them and their students’ advanced needs. In addition, suggestions were made towards upgrading the library’s technology such as new electronic data bases, library access from faculty offices and making all of the library’s resources electronically accessible. The most valued resource seems to be the Inter-Library Loan service since it gives the faculty and students access to information that is not available at the UNH Library. Other resources have also been commented as being useful, such as the Library Orientation/Instruction program that seems to be under utilized. Comments and suggestions for the Library’s other resources are also discussed within.
**Overview**

The Marvin K. Peterson Library, at the University of New Haven, is the subject of this evaluation project. The start of the project began with a meeting between the Library Director, Hanko Dobi, and the evaluation team. It was then discussed that the purpose of this evaluation is to determine how the library can better meet the needs of the population that it serves. In addition, an underlying purpose for the results of this evaluation is for support in securing necessary funds, if improvements are proposed. With the later purpose in mind, it seemed important that the project gather data that are useful in terms of objective suggestions and ideas for improvement, rather than the less useful data such as vague comments fueled by frustration.

The sample population was determined to be the professors of the University, since it is they whom are responsible for the course work, and therefore are more knowledgeable of what resources will better meet the needs of their students. In light of the target population, three focus areas are determined to be the most relevant and valid for gathering data. The first focus area is the contents and structure of the library to include such things as computer terminals, books, interior design and other forms of media. The second is the programs that are offered by the Library, and if the faculty are aware of them; an example would be the presence and frequency of library orientation/instruction programs. The last focus area is the suggestions from professors that have not been covered in the first two focus areas, for improving the functioning of the library.

Considering the type of information needed for this type of project, an improvement-focus model with elements of a process evaluation and needs assessment was the guiding theme for the survey construction. It was reasoned that the Library is an on going program and therefore cannot easily be evaluated by its end results or its impact, but can be better evaluated through its process of meeting the needs of its clients. The improvement-focus model is an excellent guide for this type of evaluation since the ultimate goal is to gather information that can be used to improve the functioning of the Library.
Methodology

The sample target population was narrowed down to just the full-time faculty members because it is believed that these professors are more likely to have utilized the library when compared to the part-time professors and adjunct professors. Hanko Dobi supplied a complete list of all the full-time faculty members, which is a total of 154 professors presently.

A survey was determined to be the best way in gathering the necessary information, but its construction took longer than the time allocated in the proposal. Additionally, the survey construction phase in the original proposal included the aid of the Library Director and Professor M. Morris, but this was not necessarily the case in the actual survey construction. The initial construction of the survey took the majority of the time because of the focus areas that it needed to cover, the sequential question structure, and the item construction themselves. The end result is a three-section survey with 17 items and is estimated to take roughly 5 to 15 minute to complete, depending on the professor’s experience with the library. (See Appendix A for the complete survey.) The complete survey was presented to the Library Director for finale approval before delivery a week before the surveys were originally scheduled for collection.

The actual delivery procedure of the survey was executed as intended in the proposal; inclusion of an explanatory introduction letter (See Appendix B for the Introduction letter.), preaddressed inter-office return envelope and hand delivery. Since the surveys were delivered behind schedule, an incentive raffle for a pair of baseball tickets to see the Bridgeport Blue Fish was used to promote an increase in the number of returns for the scheduled due date of June 16th. Fortunately, Professor M. Morris postponed the due date for completion of all the projects, which then allowed this evaluation team to reschedule the survey return due date to June 22. The bulk of the surveys were returned within the week of the 19th to the Library Director’s Secretary, Denise. The winner of the raffle was Professor Griffiths, whose name was drawn from the pile of returned surveys, and was announced on June 28th. The due date change and raffle winner announcements were done via e-mail.
Demographics of Respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Return</th>
<th>Sent</th>
<th>Sample %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Engineering</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>19.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer Science</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criminal Justice</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communications</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biology</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dietetics &amp; Institutional Man.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychology</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visual &amp; Performing Arts</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dental Hygiene</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political Science</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physics</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economics</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire Science</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathematics</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hotel &amp; Restaurant Man.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forensic Science</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total 47 132 100.0

It seems important to first describe the composite of the sample. This writer believes that from understanding the sample, the results will be interpreted more accurately when the data is put in a perspective of being a part of a larger whole that may or may not be accurately represented. A total of 47 out of 154 surveys were returned, resulting in a 31% return rate (Table 1). There were no returns from the departments of Occupational S&H (2 sent), Public Management (3 sent), Marketing (5 sent), Aviation (2 sent), Accounting (4 sent), and Education (5 sent). The department that is represented the most is the Engineering Department with 9 surveys returned, with Computer Science and Criminal Justice in a tie for second with 4 surveys returned each. It must be noted that there is an unequal amount of faculty per department. So even if the engineering department had the greatest amount of returned
surveys it only represents 30% of the department while the Dietetics department represents 50% of its department with only 1 returned survey.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of Teaching</th>
<th>Teaching Level</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>42.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Both</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>46.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Other descriptions of the sample shows 46.8% of the professors are teaching both undergraduate and graduate courses (Table 2), and the sample's average use of the UNH library is between 1 to 11 times a year (Table 3). In addition, 72% (35 respondents) of the professors stated that they incorporate the use of the library into their courses. Within the entire group of professors, 59.6% reported that the library resources make up between 1% to 25% of the course work and 12.8% reported that the library resources make up 26% to 50% of the course work (Table 4).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Library Usage</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not at all</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>14.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 to 7 times a week</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 to 4 times a month</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>21.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 to 11 times a year</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>46.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>95.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>System</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>47</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percent of Course</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>.00</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 to 25</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>59.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 to 50</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>74.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>System</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>25.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>47</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Results of focus area 3: Library Improvement Suggestions and Use

This section is a summary of the comments given by the professors. A full list of these comments can be found in Appendix C.

Why Professors do not use the UNH Library or Incorporate Library use into their courses?

It seems that the majority of the reasons for not using the UNH Library or for not incorporating it into the course work is the lack of advanced books and journals, and in some cases lack of general materials in the specific field. Some have mentioned that they acquired their own small departmental library, personal library, or access to other libraries or data bases to compensate for the lack of materials at the UNH Library. One respondent stated a more obvious reason for not incorporating the use of the library into their course, such as the course is a fundamental course and therefore the professors is personally able to supply the materials.

What can the library offer that would increase the likelihood of use?

In general, the majority of the comments seem to suggest that the library needs to be more up to date with its holdings, acquire more field specific materials, and access to certain data bases. For instance, one comment claims that the library has too many "fade" journals. The comments also suggest that some professors have had unfavorable experiences with the Library and are frustrated with using it, while one professor commented that his/her students seem to approve of the general research capabilities.

Professors' suggestions for improving the Library's Functioning

Increase and Update Holdings

When reading the comments, what seems to be the most obvious suggestion is to increase the library's holdings with more up-to-date materials and more books and journals that are specific to each field of study. To accomplish this, a few have suggested budget increases and encouraging professors to participate in material acquisitions.

Library Access from Offices

Another improvement suggestion that seems to be more related to the professors, and aiding them in time management is providing them with access to the data base and research software from their offices. Numerous comments state that it would be of great use to them if
they had this type of access. It was mentioned that through this manner, they would be aware of the resources available and would therefore increase the likelihood of incorporating the resources into their courses.

**Interlibrary loan Status Updates**

Several comments have been submitted that praise the interlibrary loan service and some that are frustrated with it. The comments that praise it state that it is a necessary resource to them since the UNH library does not have access to the materials that they would like. Those that are frustrated with it claim that it is of little use to them because of copyright laws. An important improvement suggestion for the interlibrary loan services is incorporating a request status update that would inform the requester of an issue or issues associated with the request. Professors comment that they are unsure if the request is lost, the documents could not be found, the request is on hold, or if there is some other problem when they do not receive a requested item.

**Library Instruction Programs**

One professor commented that even though the students “grumble” about having to attend one (Library Instruction Program), they generally find it useful. Some have mentioned that the Library should collaborate with the English department to create a Library Instruction course to inform the students of the resources offered and how to use them. Professors have also commented that they themselves are unaware of the resources available, and anyway of informing them of what is available would be a great help to them. In addition, comments suggest on keeping the orientation instruction program lively.

**Library Staff**

The majority of the respondents view the Library staff as being extremely friendly and courteous. Despite these comments, some have mentioned that their students do not have the same view. This suggests an inconsistency of service from the staff or maybe assisting a professor may utilize different skills than assisting a student. One comment stated that the library staff has no problem with retrieving the requested materials; he/she suggested that they should also be able to refer him/her to other similar materials or give suggestions.
Comments are generally towards the microfilm and fiche readers and copiers. Professors claim that the machines need to be upgraded because of the poor quality of prints. Others suggest a structural change to the library by incorporating study rooms for “noisy homework” and possibly a graduate student lounge because they have no other place to go. One suggested extending the library hours and even a break room for coffee. Another comment went so far as to describe a section of the library as dank and gloomy like a 1970’s video storage facility, in order to convey the point of redesigning the Library’s look.
Results of Focus Area 2: Awareness and Effectiveness of Library’s Resources

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Resource</th>
<th>Total Aware</th>
<th>Not Aware</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Microfilm and Microfiche</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main Circulation</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Material Reserves</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electronic Resources</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reference</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orient/Inst</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government Doc</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inter Library Loan</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Looking at the “Mean” (average) column, the “Mean” numbers closer to the number “1” indicate that that resource is more known by the professors than a resource with a “Mean” number that is closer to the number “2”. From this chart, the resource that is most known to the professors is the Main Circulation with a “Mean” score of 1.04, and the least known resource is the Library Orientation/Instruction program with a “Mean” score of 1.38.

“Table 6” shows that the most used resources are the electronic, reference, inter-library loan, material reserve, and microfilm and microfiche. This chart also shows that overall the respondents usually are able to retrieve over 50% of what they are searching for. Not including material reserve, Inter-Library loan, and Library Orientation/Instruction, respondents have the most success in retrieving search materials from the Main Circulation resource.
Table 7: Resources Confidence

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Resource</th>
<th>Respondents</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Interlibrary Loan</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>1.5714</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library Orientation and Instruction</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>1.2222</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Material Reserve</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>1.1852</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The material reserve, interlibrary loan, and library instruction are scaled on how confident the respondents are that the service will perform as is intended (Table 7). A number “1” means high confidence, a number “2” mean medium confidence, a number “3” means low confidence and a number “4” means zero confidence. Responds have marked that they are more confident with the performance of the materials reserve service than the library instruction service and inter-library loan service. Another indication from this chart is that respondents have more confidence in the material reserve serve than the services of the inter-library, which is validated even more by the an almost equal amount of respondents.

Table 8: Resource Adequacy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Resource</th>
<th>Total Use</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Micro and Film</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>2.400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gov. Doc</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>2.125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electronic resources</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>2.100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main Circulation</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>2.409</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reference</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>2.409</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inter-library</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>2.105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Material reserve</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>1.733</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lib orientation</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>1.571</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The next set of items asks the professors for their observations of the students’ use of the library resources. In “Table 8” the mean closest to “1” indicates that the students comment that the resource is more than adequate, a number closer to two indicates students comment that the resource is adequate and a number that is closer to “3” indicates comments that the resource is less than adequate. From “Table 8”, the resources are overall commented by the students as being between adequate and less than adequate, with the exception of material reserve and library orientation and instruction, which
are rated on different scales. Additionally, the most used resources are reference (26 responses), main circulation (25 responses), electronic resource (25 responses), and inter-library-loan (21 responses). Material Reserve is rated between extremely reliable and reliable, but is closer to reliable. Library orientation/instruction is rated as being between extremely helpful and helpful.
Discussion and Recommendations

Interlibrary Loan

The data indicates that the most used resources, for both faculty and students, seem to be the material reserve, main circulation, reference, electronic resources and interlibrary loan service. An interesting conclusion can be determined when examining the data regarding inter-library loan and professors comments. It seems that the inter-library loan service is of great value since the UNH library has limited access to certain journals that the professors prefer. The majority of the comments praise the service and state that they use it frequently. From this relationship, the recommendation is that it would prove beneficial to maintain a superior functioning Inter-library Loan service if the library is not able to secure materials as requested by the professors.

Library Orientation/Instruction

Another interesting relationship is between the use data for the Library Instruction/Orientation program and the comments. The program itself is not used much but the professors who have used it comment that it is a useful program. This program, since it is viewed as a potentially useful resource, should be developed further. As suggested by one of the professors, it may benefit both the library and the students if it were made into a course with collaboration of the English Department. It would be a reciprocal benefit between the students and the library, in regards to library use. The reasoning is that if the students were taught how to effectively use the resources that the library has, than in turn the students would use the University Library’s resources more often. This could also possibly limit the questions to the Library staff to more difficult resource problems rather than basic use issues, freeing the staff to aid those that are truly stumped.

Making Library Resources Known

The data seems to suggest that the least known and used resource, Library Orientation and Instruction, is viewed as being one of the most helpful. The issue that this relationship shows is that some of the library’s resources will most likely be used more often if more people are aware of them. Some comments by the professors support this idea, stating that there should be a way to communicate to them updated resources that are available.

Books and Journals

The data indicates that the library has the proper resources sections (i.e. reference area and microfilm) and adequate staff, but the problem seems to be the content and age of the
materials, the library access technology and inconsistent performance of the staff. One of the major issues commented on is the lack of materials in the library’s current holding. Many professors wrote that they personally don’t use the UNH library as much because it does not have the in-depth current materials that they need. As a consequence they are forced to acquire their own personal library or allocate department funds to attain them. An adjacent issue is the age of the materials in the library. It is reasonable to view that a lot of the information in some fields, such as computer science or dentistry, have a very short half-life and need to be updated regularly.

As suggested by the comments, this issue could possibly be resolved by either increasing the library’s purchase budget, encouraging professors to partake in the materials acquisition procedure or both if possible. It seems that budgeting may work since a lot of the professors seem to support the increase. Encouraging the professors to partake in the materials acquisition would also be a benefit if budgets do not allow for a materials purchase increase. This procedure would likely increase the usefulness of the materials purchased, because it is being purchased for people who are waiting to use them rather than purchasing materials that wait for people to use them. Some comments seem to suggest that there is a procedure similar to what is described above, possibly called a journal requisition form, but this researcher has not been able to determine if it does exist. Although an item that is normally sent out to the professors informing them of the journal holdings does exist, it is still not clear if this is the form mentioned in the comments.

Ideally both budget increase and incorporating the professors into materials acquisition would likely be a step in improving the library’s function, but if neither is possible than a different approach may be of aid. Some professors have commented that they had to use their own department funds to acquire needed resources. Possibly this willingness of some departments to allocate funds for materials can be used as a subsidizing fund for the library to purchase that department’s requested material, to be held in the library. For example, if a department needed legitimate resources but the library cannot afford to purchase it, then the difference between the actual price of the resources and what the Library can afford will be covered by the sponsoring department. In this way the cost can be distributed and neither party needs to bare the brunt of the entire purchase. Granted this procedure may produce certain unwanted paper work or red tape but it would allow the department to attain needed materials and the library to increase its holdings.
Library Technology

The next issue commented on is the technology that the library currently possesses. Professors have commented that it would be of great value to them if they could access all of the libraries resources from their offices. The reasoning seems to be that it would save them valuable time and make them more able to advise their students on which resources to use and how to use it. This seems like a reasonable request, but this evaluator is unsure of the equipment, the labor, and the time needed to setup the library to deliver that type of access. It seems logical to consult the University’s Information Services department on the feasibility of this service before commenting any further. A foreseeable issue for this access may possibly be budgeting, which maybe distributed amongst the departments.

Library Staff

The issues brought up through the comments generally do not criticize the library staff but rather acknowledge their friendly costumer service. An interesting comparison that has risen from the comments is the difference in service between faculty and students. A couple of respondents suggested that their favorable experience with the library staff might not be similar to their students experience with the library staff. This issue may need to be explored further by gathering data from the students and staff them selves. The exploration may reveal whether or not there is a discrepancy between the service to the faculty and students, and if there is a discrepancy, some clues as to why it is present may arise. This would ultimately improve the library’s understanding of what the students need and expect and how the staff believes it should be provided.
Limitations of This Study

Sample

The interpretations and conclusions made herein cannot entirely describe the needs and behaviors of the clients of the University's Library. This evaluation managed to gather a sample that is a fraction of the entire client population. The library mainly serves two distinct populations, the faculty and the students. Within these populations there are also sub-divisions of full or part-time and undergraduate or graduate clients that all require different resources from the library. The concern brought about by the sampled population is that the interpretations and conclusions can only be applied to the full-time professors that responded to this evaluation. If further studies are planned, a recommendation for the sample population is to include the 8 subcategories of full and part-time undergraduate and graduate professors and full and part-time undergraduates and graduate students. This would most likely create a sample that is more representative of the Library's clients.

The survey

The survey itself may also have biased the data from the questions that it asks. It seems extremely time consuming and labor intensive to include in a survey the questions that would gather all the information that would ever be needed. Additionally, that type of survey would be so long as to discourage respondents from spending the time to complete and return them. So as a suggestion for future studies, multiple smaller surveys might be better at collecting important information. Although careful attention needs to be paid to the length of time in between the surveys, because sending them too close together would saturate the population with too many surveys to complete and sending them too far apart would give snapshots of the population that has changed over time; possibly making the information in the older surveys incompatible with the information from the newer surveys.
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UNH LIBRARY SURVEY
Evaluation Project

Instructions: Please place a check mark next to the response that best indicates your answer. Place one check mark within each item unless indicated differently within that item.

Section 1

Item 1. Please check mark the level of students that you teach.
Undergraduate___ Graduate___ Undergraduate and Graduate___

Item 2. Please check mark the library resources and services that you are aware of.
Check mark all that applies.

Microfilm and Microfiche___ Electronic Resources___ Government Documents___
Main Circulation___ Reference___ Inter-library loans___
Material Reserves___ Library Orientation and Instruction___

Item 3. Please check mark the frequency in which you have utilized the UNH library within the past academic year? Please check mark one response.

Not at all___ *If you have check marked “not at all” please skip to Question 1, 2, and 3.
1 to 7 times a day___ 1 to 7 times a week___ *If you have check marked a response
1 to 4 times a month___ 1 to 11 times a year___ to the left, please proceed to Section 2

Question 1. Please write in the space below the reason(s) why you chose not to utilize the UNH library.

Question 2. Please write in the space below possible services or resources (if any) that the UNH library might offer that would increase the likelihood that you would utilize the UNH library.

Question 3. Please write in the space below possible changes (if any) to the library’s physical appearance, hours of operation, or staffing that would increase the likelihood that you would utilize the UNH library. After this response please skip to Item 12.

Section 2
This section will attempt to gather information about your use of the library, your suggestions and comments, and your successfulness and confidence when using the library’s resources.

**Item 4.** Respond to this item only if you have utilized the Microfilm and or Microfiche resource at the UNH library.

4a. I am usually successful in retrieving ____ percent of the information I am searching for. *Please check mark one response.*
75% to 100%____  50% to 74%____  25% to 49%____  24% to 0%____

4b. Please write in the space below any comments on the current effectiveness of this resource or any suggestions for its improvement.

**Item 5.** Respond to this item only if you have utilized the Electronic Resources at the UNH library.

5a. I am usually successful in retrieving ____ percent of the information I am searching for. *Please check mark one response.*
75% to 100%____  50% to 74%____  25% to 49%____  24% to 0%____

5b. Do you have any comments on the current effectiveness of this resource or any suggestions for its improvement?

**Item 6.** Respond to this item only if you have utilized the Government Documents resource at the UNH library.

6a. I am usually successful in retrieving ____ percent of the information I am searching for. *Please check mark one response.*
75% to 100%____  50% to 74%____  25% to 49%____  24% to 0%____

6b. Do you have any comments on the current effectiveness of this resource or any suggestions for its improvement?
Item 7. Respond to this item only if you have utilized the Main Circulation resource at the UNH library.

7a. I am usually successful in retrieving ___ percent of the information I am searching for. Please check mark one response.

75% to 100% ___ 50% to 74% ___ 25% to 49% ___ 24% to 0% ___

7b. Do you have any comments on the current effectiveness of this resource or any suggestions for its improvement?

Item 8. Respond to this item only if you have utilized the Reference resource at the UNH library.

8a. I am usually successful in retrieving ___ percent of the information I am searching for. Please check mark one response.

75% to 100% ___ 50% to 74% ___ 25% to 49% ___ 24% to 0% ___

8b. Do you have any comments on the current effectiveness of this resource or any suggestions for its improvement?

Item 9. Respond to this item only if you have utilized the Inter-Library Loan service at the UNH library.

9a. My level of confidence in receiving the requested items is: 

Please check mark one response.

High ___ Medium ___ Low ___ Zero ___

9b. Do you have any comments on the current effectiveness of this resource or any suggestions for its improvement?

Item 10. Respond to this item only if you have utilized the Material Reserves service at the UNH library.
10a. My level of confidence that my reserved materials will be available to my students when they request it is:

*Please check mark one response.*

High _____ Medium _____ Low _____ Zero _____

10b. Do you have any comments on the current effectiveness of this resource or any suggestions for its improvement?

**Item 11.** Respond to this item only if you have utilized the Library Orientation and Instruction service at the UNH library.

11a. My level of confidence that the library orientation and instruction service will increase my students’ library research skills is:

*Please check mark one response.*

High _____ Medium _____ Low _____ Zero _____

11b. Do you have any comments on the current effectiveness of this resource or any suggestions for its improvement?

**Section 3**

**Item 12.** Please check mark if you incorporate the use of library resources in some or in all of the courses that you teach?

No _____ *If no please respond to Item 15.*

Yes _____ *If yes please proceed to Item 13.*

**Item 13.** On average, library resources make up how much of a percent of the course work?

*Between:

*Please check mark one response*

1% to 25% _____ 26% to 50% _____ 51% to 75% _____ 76% to 100% _____

**Item 14.** What library service do you direct your students to use?

*Check mark all that applies.*

14a. Microfilm and Microfiche

Please check mark if your students normally comment that this resource is:

More than adequate _____ Adequate _____ Less than adequate _____ No comments _____

14b. Electronic Resources

Please check mark if your students normally comment that this resource is:
More than adequate____ Adequate____ Less than adequate____ No comments____

--- 14c. Government Documents
Please check mark if your students normally comment that this resource is:
More than adequate____ Adequate____ Less than adequate____ No comments____

--- 14d. Main Circulation
Please check mark if your students normally comment that this resource is:
More than adequate____ Adequate____ Less than adequate____ No comments____

--- 14e. Reference
Please check mark if your students normally comment that this resource is:
More than adequate____ Adequate____ Less than adequate____ No comments____

--- 14f. Inter-library loans
Please check mark if your students normally comment that this service is:
More than adequate____ Adequate____ Less than adequate____ No comments____

--- 14g. Material reserves
Please check mark if your students normally comment that this service is:
Extremely reliable____ Reliable____ Less than reliable____ No comments____

--- 14h. Library Orientation and instruction
Please check mark if your students normally comment that this service is:
Extremely helpful____ Helpful____ Not helpful____ No comments____

After responding to Item 14, please skip to Item 17.

**Item 15.** Please write in the space below the reason why you chose not to incorporate the use of the library in your courses.

**Item 16.** Please write in the space below any services or resources that the library might be able to offer that would increase your likelihood of incorporating the use of the library into your courses.

**Item 17.** Please write in the space below any suggestions or comments that you would like to make, which has not already been mentioned above, regarding the effectiveness of the library in meeting the needs of the faculty and students.
Appendix B

Return Date: Before June 16, 2000

Please place the return mailing-label on this same inter-office envelope to return your completed survey.

Your Response is Greatly Appreciated

Dear Faculty Member:

(Purpose and Confidentiality)
You have been selected to participate in an evaluation project that is surveying the faculty’s use of the UNH library. The two graduate students conducting the evaluation project will be the only ones who see the information that you provide, assuring confidentiality. Please be aware that your full participation is greatly appreciated and your efforts in accurately completing the survey will result in future improvements that will be aimed at benefiting both you and the students at UNH. Dependent on your experience with the UNH library the estimated time to complete the survey is between 5 and 15 minutes.

(Incentive)
All faculty members, who return completed surveys by June 16, will be entered into a raffle to win a pair of tickets to a regular season Bridgeport Bluefish baseball home game. If you prefer not to receive the original prize, an alternative prize of equal value can be arranged.

(Questions)
If you have any questions or concerns when completing the survey, please feel free to call Sommay (Som-my) at 203-624-5114 or Tim at 203-373-0328, and one of us will return your call within 24 hours.

Sincerely,

Sommay Souphanya
Timothy Aucoin

Graduate Student Evaluators
Appendix C

Item 4b. Microfilm and Microfiche

1. “I don’t use this much, but when ever I have had occasion to use it, it has been adequate. Need better readers and equipment for making hard copy.”
2. “The copy machines for the microfilm/fiche are horrendous, need new readers and printers.”
3. “We need more journals available to our students and associated research.”
4. “Better communication for first time users (where it is located and especially tell students how to use it).”
5. “We need more journals available to our students and associated research.”
6. “Effective.”
7. “Recently had a problem with library staff finding fiche due to how it was filed.”
8. “I hate it any way, I’d like to see it all replaced with CD’s”.

Item 5b. Electronic Resources

(The comments towards the electronic resource’s section are limited.)
1. “Limited in what you can search capabilities.”
2. “The resource needs to include electronic journals link databases to interlibrary loan.”
3. “Sources need to be expanded.”

Item 6b. Government documents

1. “Keep updating.”
2. “Don’t have docs I would want (from US geo/survey + EPA)”
3. “Fine as is.”
4. “Suggestions from staff for additional materials and more friendliness!”
5. “Can be placed online.”

Item 7b. Main Circulation

1. “I am confused here... I am always able to find the material that the library has, but ⅔ of the time the library doesn’t have it and I have to get it through Inter-Lib Loan.”
2. “There is not much current material for chemistry, but I sometimes read some of the stuff upstairs.”
3. “Get more current books/resources!”
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4. "Excellent for my needs."
5. "The collection needs to be built up in all areas, not just the ones that are currently trendy. We purchase too much on dental hygiene and policing."
6. "Bigger holdings."

**Item 8b. Reference**

1. "Varies depending on who’s on duty."
2. "Get more current books/resources!"
3. "Need more materials."
4. "Fewer law books, more up-to-date reference materials (including CD ROMs in basic areas)."

**Item 9b. Inter-Library Loan**

1. "Great but status of some requested articles unknown."
2. "Everyone works very hard on this and I appreciate his or her efforts."
3. "The request forms are very tedious to fill out by hand; there should be a way of doing this electronically."
4. "Vital to me and well conducted."
5. "This is a disgrace to the university of New Haven!"
6. "Be sure to notify patrons when an item is not available."
7. "I have had difficulty with receiving material in the past. Feedback/tracking of requests to keep me notified if there is a problem (so that I may find resources by another method) would be helpful."
8. "The best sources of the library."
9. "The system is cumbersome and not very effective due to copyright limitations."

**Item 10b. Material Reserves**

1. "Use it constantly."
2. "Haven’t heard any complaints."
3. "This service is convenient, but a few students find it hard to retrieve item. Should I deposit them by my name, class # etc., what?"
4. "Cross-referencing between my course and electronic source listing for students."
5. "Students do not have any problems that I am aware of."
6. "Not enough enforcement on time limits."
7. "I use this resource frequently and have been happy with service. Would be nice to setup reserves on line."

8. "This is a good source and it works well."

**Item 11b. Library Orientation/Instruction**

1. "Keep it lively."

2. "Students grumble about having to do it, but all seem to find it useful other wards."

**Question #1. Please write in the space below the reason(s) why you chose not to utilize the UNH Library.**

1. "Not needed in intro to thermo and engineering graphics."

2. "Most needed resources are available to students in a small dept. library + faculty’s personal collection."

3. "Out dated materials."

4. "It is a general course and I find it more efficient to supply the resources that the text is inadequate with supplying."

5. "I may ask the students to check for things in the library if they cannot find them elsewhere. In general the CS book collection is pitiful and out of date, so it is a useless resource for the students. My classes have not really needed the journals."

6. "I feel it is important that students own their own copies of texts so that they can utilize them to the max. However, I am considering allowing them more opportunity to do optional reading, in which case I will probably use library reserves more."

7. "The chemistry journals are not well organized for lit. Search and we have no easy search method; most students use the net for assignments - although I think the net is at a very low-tech level."

8. "I use the ILL to obtain research articles/advanced book, in math, because UNH can’t afford to subscribe to math research journals."

9. "Lots of books in my discipline would be nice. Usually students go to bigger libraries where one-stop shop is possible or to Internet resources. Journals alone aren’t enough."

10. "Not many appropriate resources, not the library’s fault, but mine for not assigning the appropriate work."

11. "Students are free to use the library if they wish (and most do so) but I do not require a specific amount of work as part of the course."
Question 2. Please write in the space below possible services or resources (if any) that the UNH library might offer that would increase the likelihood that you would utilize the UNH library.

1. “Access electronic journal in classroom so students can access in site Chemical abstracts and papers not available at Peterson library, had to use department funds to obtain access.”

2. “Need access to better medical journals or Yale medical library for upper level course.”

3. “A wider range and up to date set of books for CS, so the students might have a chance of finding something. It is my understanding that something is being done about this.”

4. “I used to use more resources, but I found the lack of journals very frustrating (I tried to build a collection of articles through inter-lib. loan, but ran into copy right problems).”

5. “I need to learn what ref. holdings we have and how the students can search them so I can design assign assignments around the resources we have. Adding some current leading ref. sources would be a big help.”

6. “You do a good job- students seem to approve of the general research capabilities of the library.”

7. “Again, more journals on CD less Micro crap.”

Open Suggestions

1. “Generally a good job. Please encourage faculty to submit requests for new books/journals, might help you leverage more money out of the administration.”

2. “UNH not competitive in electronic diversity, I no longer receive library additions list, grads would benefit from lounge, due to budget considerations library has fallen behind in acquiring new materials.”

3. “Biggest problem with UNH Library is lack of adequate resources because of budget. Research is hampered by inadequate number of current books, and even more so by lack of journals related to specific disciplines.”

4. “I consider many of the people working in the library my friends. They have been helpful and wonderful. Of course it would be extremely helpful if the library had more of the latest resources that are of use to me.”

5. “The library resources in my area (computer science) are inadequate: the books are out of date and we have not had much success in ordering new books.”
6. “Need more up to date books.”
7. “Better system needed for new book purchases. Need to support graduate programs and work w/faculty on what resources and services are needed especially to support grad programs.”
8. “In general I have heard from students that the library can be too noisy to get any work done, so they don’t bother to use it as a study place.”
9. “Having been at the University for only a few months I have not had the opportunity to utilize the library.”
10. “A lot more support is needed by the administration to bring the library up to the appropriate University level!”
11. “Stopped recommending book purchases because I put a lot of effort in for zero results. Things may be different now but have been burned too often by budgetary turn-arounds to be involved at all. Acquisitions are important to me.”
13. “Inter-library-loan is extremely useful and, indeed, essential. Without it I would be lost. I have found the library staff to be courteous, professional, + helpful. My students sometimes report that their experiences differ significantly from mine.”
14. “I’m new here, but it seems we have limited resources in my disciplines; it would be nice if we could have access to other libraries’ with these holdings in an official way.”
15. “I believe the library needs a much larger budget. I would also like to see the library develop a mandatory course (grad and undergrad) on utilizing the library for research purposes. (Possibly in conjunction with the English dept.)”
16. “Library needs a warehouse of videos (instructors’ lectures and playback capability), bookshop and coffee shop, group workrooms for “noisy” homework interaction.”
17. “Increase the book budget.”
18. “It meets my course needs, students today use Internet/computer in SEAS and elsewhere, including other area libraries, for their required work.”
19. “New acquisitions of books and periodicals in the area of Computer engineering. Allocating some funds to new programs would be helpful.”
20. “Slow response to phone inquiries, misinformation, not helpful.”
21. “Library personnel have always been very friendly and accommodating.”
22. “Library collection seems to grow weaker each year. Some journal subscriptions are not renewed, important books in key area are not purchased, and there is a general sense that the collection reflects the state of knowledge in 1990 or 80.”

23. “Our library does not have recent books and references in my field. Many of the holdings are very old. Library should spend money to buy new books and reference materials. My personal library is much better than that of the university.”

24. “Continue to acquire more up to date computer science books.”

25. “Put catalog in electronic form and on-line (so can be searched over the internet to see if in collection, ideally if a copy is available at the time, perhaps even to reserve it over net). Some of collection may become electronic and could be on-line.”

26. “Thanks for sending out this question sheet. That act has raised the library profile for me.”

27. “Lack of current holdings, Library is barely adequate to support my technical area of expertise at this time.”

28. “The journal collection is inadequate. I often refer students to the Yale medical library.”

29. “Need additional resources.”

30. “You need a big grant to increase holdings. Ask Prince Alaweed.”

31. “Need to expand online access to all materials. The paper would remain but electronic media is where the growth will be.”